

Application Serial No. 10/662,034

Attorney Docket No. 200309970-1

REMARKS/ARGUMENTSClaim Status

Claims 1 13 and 42-44 are pending. Claims 1-13 and 42-44 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 12, 42, 43, and 44 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 12, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,122,758).

Claims 1, 12, and 43 have been amended to clarify how the claimed subject matter distinguishes from the teachings of Johnson. For example, claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the bus controller is coupled to the system bus and to an internal bus. Support for this limitation may be found, for example, in FIG. 2A of the present application, in which bus controller 208 is coupled to system bus 202 and to an internal bus 216 and 252.

Claim 1 further specifies that the first first-in first-out (FIFO) buffer (e.g., buffer 214 in FIG. 2A) is coupled to the send machine (e.g., send machine 210 in FIG. 2A), that the first FIFO is further coupled between the host processor (e.g., host processor

Application Serial No. 10/662,034

Attorney Docket No. 200309970-1

238) and the bus controller (e.g., bus controller 208) over the internal bus (e.g., bus including 216 and 252), and that the first FIFO (e.g., FIFO 214) is not coupled to the send machine (e.g., send machine 210) over the internal bus (e.g., bus including 216 and 252).

Johnson does not disclose all of these limitations. In particular, the Office Action interprets the system interface processor 312 of FIG. 7 of Johnson as a "bus controller," the request queue 516 as a "first FIFO," the MDR 707 as a "send machine," and the ISA bus 226 as an "internal bus" within the meaning of claim 1. Even if this interpretation is assumed to be correct for purposes of argument, the bus controller 312 in FIG. 7 of Johnson is not coupled to the internal bus 226. Instead bus controller 312 is coupled to queues 514 and 516 over lines (unlabeled) which are distinct from the internal bus 226.

For at least this reason, claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Johnson. Claims 2-4 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and therefore patentably distinguish over Johnson for at least the same reason.

Claim 12 has been amended to include substantially the same relevant limitation as claim 1 and therefore patentably distinguishes over Johnson for at least the same reason.

Application Serial No. 10/662,034

Attorney Docket No. 200309970-1

Claim 43 has been amended to include substantially the same relevant limitation as claim 1 and therefore patentably distinguishes over Johnson for at least the same reason.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 6-8, 9, 10-11, and 13 stand rejected over Johnson in view of various other previously-cited references. Neither Johnson nor any of these other references, either singly or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-mentioned requirement that the bus controller be coupled to the system bus and to an internal bus.

Claims 5, 6-8, 9, and 10-11 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and therefore include at least the same limitations as claim 1. Claims 5, 6-8, 9, and 10-11, therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited combinations for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 13 depends, either directly or indirectly, from claim 12 and therefore includes at least the same limitations as claim 12. Claim 13, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited combinations for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claim 12.

Claim 42 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Feeney, Cao, and Webb. Neither Johnson nor any of these other references, either singly or in

Application Serial No. 10/662,034

Attorney Docket No. 200309970-1

combination, teaches or suggests the above-mentioned requirement that the bus controller be coupled to the system bus and to an internal bus. Claim 42 has been amended to include substantially the same relevant limitation as claim 1 and therefore patentably distinguishes over the cited combination for at least the same reason.

Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Cao. Neither Johnson nor Cao, either singly or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-mentioned requirement that the bus controller be coupled to the system bus and to an internal bus. Claim 44 has been amended to include substantially the same relevant limitation as claim 1 and therefore patentably distinguishes over the cited combination for at least the same reason.

Application Serial No. 10/662,034

Attorney Docket No. 200309970-1


CONCLUSIONS

Any dependent claims not specifically discussed above depend, either directly or indirectly, from the independent claims discussed above and therefore are patentable for at least the same reason(s).

If the Examiner wishes to discuss this Response, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the phone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for extension of time is otherwise absent, applicant hereby requests any extension of time. Please charge any fees or make any credits, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Plotkin, Esq.
Reg. No. 43,861

February 9, 2007
Date

Robert Plotkin, P.C.
91 Main Street, Suite 204
Concord, MA 01742-2527
Tel: (978) 318-9914
Fax: (978) 318-9060